



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/507,932	01/09/2006	Mark G. Erlander	14255-052US1	7099

26161 7590 06/16/2010
FISH & RICHARDSON PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

CHUNDURU, SURYAPRABHA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1637

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

06/16/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Applicants' response to the office action field on March 15, 2010 has been considered and acknowledged.

Status of the application

2. Currently claims 2-38 are pending under examination. Claim 1 is cancelled. Applicants' arguments and the amendment have been fully considered and deemed persuasive in-part for the reasons that follow. The action is made FINAL.

Response to arguments:

3. With regard to the rejection of claims 2-38 obviousness type of double-patenting, Applicants' arguments and the amendment were fully considered and the rejection is withdrawn herein in view of the persuasive arguments.

4. With regard to the rejection of claims 2-38 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziman et al. in view of Godfrey et al., Applicants' arguments were fully considered and found unpersuasive. With regard to the Applicants' arguments drawn to improper combination of different methods that serve different purposes, Examiner notes that MPEP 2144 (R-5) states 'the reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve a different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant.' >See, e.g., In re Kahn, 441 F.3d 977, 987, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2006). Thus there is no requirement that the prior art should provide the same reason as the applicant to make the claimed invention. With regard to the arguments drawn to the incubation period, it is noted that the amendment recites 180 minutes or less which is within the scope of the teachings of Ziman et

al. disclosing 270 minutes or less, wherein 'less' represents less than 270 minutes that reads on 180 minutes or less, which can be optimized using routine optimization. Further with regard to the arguments drawn to inoperative combination of the prior art, since the methods are different and Ziman et al. discloses that the cDNA synthesis is completed in 120 minutes, which differs from the instant claim 2. The arguments were found unpersuasive. First as noted in the MPEP 2145 One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., Inc., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Second, obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in thereferences themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir.1992). In this case, specific motivation is provided in the rejection, which states that an ordinary practitioner would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Ziman et al. with the step of completing the reaction in less time as taught by Godfrey et al. because one skilled in the art would have a reasonable expectation of success that the combination would result in a rapid, automated method for RT-PCR (see col. 2, line 62-67, col. 3, line 1-3) and such modification of the method would be considered as obvious over cited prior art. Third, the amendment of claim 2, did not change the scope of the claim, since the combination does render the claims obvious as discussed above since the method of Ziman et al. could be modified in view of Godfrey et al. to acheive a rapid method for producing amplified RNA as discussed in the rejection.

Conclusion

No claims are allowable.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suryaprabha Chunduru whose telephone number is 571-272-0783. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30A.M. - 4.30P.M, Mon - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on 571-272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Application/Control Number: 10/507,932
Art Unit: 1637

Page 5

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Suryaprabha Chunduru/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1637